

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

LEONARDO RAMOS-HERNANDEZ,

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

POPULAR DEMOCRATIC PARTY,

**Defendant.**

**Civil No. 10-1688 (JAF)**

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Plaintiff ACAN Leonardo Ramos-Hernandez, USN, has filed a *pro se* complaint, which he says is a "Recurso de Revision," against the Popular Democratic Party pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the due process clause, the equal protection clause, the Puerto Rico Electoral Law "and any other statute [sic] that may provide the relieve [sic] requested, including freedom of press and speech." (Docket No. 2)

He alleges harm because "candidates of concern," which he does not identify, are raising money, presumably for an electoral contest, "contrary to by-laws," which he doesn't identify either.

The Court has conducted a review of the Complaint, construing it liberally, see Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), in an attempt to "intuit the correct cause of action, even if it was imperfectly pled," Ahmed v. Rosenblatt, 118 F.3d 886, 890 (1st Cir. 1997).

Civil No. 10-1688 (JAF)

2

A complaint requires only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. at 93. The Complaint, however, makes absolutely no sense. It doesn't even allege a conceivable entitlement of relief. The Court is under no obligation to interpret this Complaint, nor is it under any obligation to evaluate whether plaintiff has suffered damages. The Complaint clearly violates Rule 8(a). "[A] plaintiff's obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement requires more than labels and conclusions." Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550, U.S. 544, 555 (2007). See generally, Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S.Ct. 1937 (2009).

The Complaint is summarily **DISMISSED**. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

San Juan, Puerto Rico, August 2, 2010.

S/JOSE ANTONIO FUSTE

JOSE ANTONIO FUSTE, CHIEF  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE